

REMARKS

Claims 1-28 are pending in this application. In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of all claims are earnestly solicited.

I. Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §102

The Office Action rejects claims 1-3, 5-9 and 12-13 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Yokokawa. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

A. Product Claims 1-3

As described in paragraph [0010] of the specification, a known problem with conventional solutions for processing (i.e. stretching, forging or another procedure for processing a preform or drawing a fibre) comprising two mobile modules, is that it is almost impossible to achieve sufficiently stable conditions in a single processing device. Ideally, oscillations of the processing or drawing device are minimized in order to produce a product with higher quality. However, it is impossible to achieve this result as taught by the prior art solutions because the end product is moved relative to the body of the processing device.

In order to overcome this known problem, the device of claim 1 requires "the gripping means and the heating device are arranged are optionally moveable so that they allow *the end product produced to be held in position during the processing process relative to the body of the processing device*...by holding the gripping means on the side of the end product of the preform in position relative to the body of the processing device." By holding the end product in position during the processing process relative to the body of the processing device, the above-described problems can be overcome. See specification, paragraph [0011].

The arrangement of the claimed device, wherein the end product generated in the processing is kept in position relative to the body of the processing device, ensures the achievement of an end product having the best possible quality. Quality of this level cannot

be achieved when the gripping means on the side of the end product are moved relative to the body of the device, as taught by Yokokawa.

Additionally, an advantage of claimed device is that the position in which the preform is installed and from which it is removed can be selected more freely because of the optionally movable gripping means and heating device. Furthermore, the stretching or drawing direction can be selected freely and gripping means on the side of the end product can be held in position in relation to the processing device irrespective of the stretching or drawing direction. At the same time, maintenance work on the apparatus becomes easier. Since the drawing can also be performed using two movements, the third movement remains to be used for other process adjustment measures.

Despite its asserted disclosures, Yokokawa fails to disclose such a device having the features recited by claim 1. Instead, Yokokawa, in Figures 3a-3c and the Abstract, shows and describes that the gripping means on the side of the end product are always moved during the processing. Because of this configuration, the end product is always being moved relative to the body of the processing device disclosed by Yokokawa. Such a feature is antithetical to the features required of the device of claim 1.

For at least this reason, Yokokawa fails to anticipate independent claim 1 and the claims dependent therefrom. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

B. Method Claims 5-9, 12, and 13

Claim 5 is directed to a method of processing/stretching a perform that requires "processing the preform by feeding it to the heating device by moving one of the gripping means and the heating means and by holding the gripping means on the side of the end product of the preform in position relative to the body of the processing device whereby *the*

end product produced also remains in position relative to the body of the processing device, irrespective of the direction of the processing/stretching" (emphasis added).

Despite its asserted disclosures, Yokokawa also fails to disclose the process of claim 5. As discussed above, Yokokawa instead describes a process where the gripping means on the side of the end product are always moved during the processing of a glass rod or tube by drawing. Accordingly, the end product is always being moved relative to the body of the processing device as disclosed by Yokokawa. This is antithetical to the claimed process, wherein "the end product produced...remains in position relative to the body of the processing device," as recited by independent claim 5.

For at least this reason, Yokokawa fails to anticipate independent claim 5 and the claims dependent therefrom. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

II. Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103

A. Yokokawa And Symborski

The Office Action rejects claim 4 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly having been obvious over Yokokawa in view of Symborski. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claim 4 depends from claim 1, and requires all of the limitations set forth in claim 1. The deficiencies of Yokokawa with respect to claim 1 are discussed above. Despite its asserted teachings, Symborski fails to cure at least these deficiencies. Thus, Yokokawa and Symborski, considered either separately or combined, fail to teach or suggest all of the limitations of claim 4. Thus, claim 4 would not have been rendered obvious by Yokokawa and Symborski.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

B. Yokokawa And Yamamura

The Office Action rejects claims 10 and 11 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly having been obvious over Yokokawa in view of Yamamura. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claims 10 and 11 depend from claim 5, and require all of the limitations set forth in claim 5. The deficiencies of Yokokawa with respect to claim 5 are discussed above. Despite its asserted teachings, Yamamura fails to cure at least these deficiencies. Thus, Yokokawa and Yamamura, considered either separately or combined, fail to teach or suggest all of the limitations of claims 10 and 11. Thus, claims 10 and 11 would not have been rendered obvious by Yokokawa and Yamamura.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

C. Yokokawa And McMoore

The Office Action rejects claim 14 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly having been obvious over Yokokawa in view of McMoore. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claim 14 depends from claim 5, and requires all of the limitations set forth in claim 5. The deficiencies of Yokokawa with respect to claim 5 are discussed above. Despite its asserted teachings, McMoore fails to cure at least these deficiencies. Thus, Yokokawa and McMoore, considered either separately or combined, fail to teach or suggest all of the limitations of claim 14. Thus, claim 14 would not have been rendered obvious by Yokokawa and McMoore.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

D. Yokokawa And Fleming

The Office Action rejects claim 15 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly having been obvious over Yokokawa in view of Fleming. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claim 15 depends from claim 5, and requires all of the limitations set forth in claim 5. The deficiencies of Yokokawa with respect to claim 5 are discussed above. Despite its asserted teachings, Fleming fails to cure at least these deficiencies. Thus, Yokokawa and Fleming, considered either separately or combined, fail to teach or suggest all of the limitations of claim 15. Thus, claim 15 would not have been rendered obvious by Yokokawa and Fleming.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

E. Yokokawa And Drummond

The Office Action rejects claims 16-19, 21-25 and 28 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly having been obvious over Yokokawa in view of Drummond. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Independent claim 16 is directed to a device for drawing an optical fibre from a preform wherein "the heating device and one of the gripping means are movable relative to the body of the drawer and to the other gripping means, which is immovable relative to the body of the drawer and to which a coiling device is connected for coiling the end product/optical fibre to a coil, whereby both a heating device and the gripping means that is movable relative to the body of the drawer move relative to the coiling device that receives the end product/optical fibre."

Likewise, independent claim 21 is directed to a method of drawing an optical fibre from a preform comprising "coiling the produced optical fibre with a coiling device arranged in the gripping means that is immobile relative to the body of the drawer onto a coil, whereby both a furnace and the gripping means that is movable relative to the body of the drawer move relative to the coiling device that receives the end product/optical fibre irrespective of the selected drawing direction."

For reasons similar to those discussed above with respect to independent claims 1 and 5, Yokokawa fails to teach or suggest all of the limitations of claims 16 and 21. Drummond, which is only relied upon by the Office Action for its asserted disclosure relating to gripping means containing coiling means, fails to at least cure the other deficiencies of Yokokawa with respect to claims 16 and 21. Accordingly, the combined teachings of Yokokawa and Drummond would not have rendered obvious independent claims 16 and 21 and the claims dependent therefrom. Thus, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

F. Yokokawa, Drummond And Symborski

The Office Action rejects claim 20 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly having been obvious over Yokokawa in view of Drummond and further in view of Symborski. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claim 20 depends from, and requires all the limitations of, independent claim 16. As discussed above, the combined teachings of Yokokawa and Drummond fail to teach or suggest every limitation of independent claim 16. Despite its asserted disclosures, Symborski fails to cure these deficiencies.

Thus, Yokokawa, Drummond and Symborski, considered either individually or in any combination, would not have rendered obvious claim 20. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

G. Yokokawa, Drummond And Yamamura

The Office Action rejects claims 26 and 27 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly having been obvious over Yokokawa in view of Drummond and further in view of Yamamura. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claims 26 and 27 depend from claim 21, and require all of the limitations set forth in claim 21. The deficiencies of Yokokawa with respect to claim 21 are discussed above.

Despite its asserted teachings, Dummond and Yamamura fail to cure at least these deficiencies. Thus, Yokokawa, Drummond and Yamamura, considered either separately or combined, fail to teach or suggest all of the limitations of claims 26 and 27. Thus, Yokokawa, Drummond and Yamamura, considered either individually or in any combination, would not have rendered obvious claims 26 and 27.


Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

III. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of this application are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,


James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Hee H. Smith
Registration No. 57,631

JAO:HHS

Date: September 9, 2008

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 19928
Alexandria, Virginia 22320
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

<p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p>
--